



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,083	07/10/2000	John R. Ehrman	STL9-2000-0055	9437

47069 7590 03/01/2005

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,083

Applicant(s)

EHRMAN, JOHN R.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the IDS, and amendment filed on 9/23, and 11/3/2004 respectively.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 9/23/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The references whose copies are missing have been crossed out indicating the references which have not been considered, because their hard copies are missing from the case. Applicant states that the IDS was filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), and that the missing references (books) were filed in the same box as the IDS (page 8, lines 11-19). It is noted that the IDS is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), because the references are missing from the case. The examiner has looked for them, and could not find them. Therefore, these missing book references cannot be considered until they are present in the case.

Art Unit: 2178

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 7/10/2000 have been accepted by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Appropriate corrections were made to claims 1-24. Therefore, their 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's disclosure (pages 3-7, filed on 7/10/2000), in view of Edberg et al, hereinafter Edberg (Pat. # 5,793,381, 8/11/1998, as disclosed by the applicant on 2/2/2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF" from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28). A Hexadecimal encoding of the non-Unicode text string—*constant*-- is created, and *stored in*

Art Unit: 2178

memory locations (boxes enclosing the character encoding) found in computer memory (lines 19-21).

Moreover, applicant discloses the translation of the text string—"abcDEF" as stored in hexadecimal code in memory to Unicode format hexadecimal code, and replacing the same characters with Unicode code stored in memory—*storing the Unicode character string in the constant, creating a string of Unicode characters stored in memory; associating a string of non-Unicode characters with the constant which is stored in the memory of the computer* (page 5, lines 10-28).

Furthermore, the applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *retrieving a specification in which the non-Unicode character string is encoded, and translating the non-Unicode character string...responsive to the specification of the code page*. However, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings to Unicode using a mapping table—*code page*-- containing the Unicode or "second character encoding" for converting the non-Unicode string to Unicode (col.3, lines 57-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of applicant, and Edberg, because this would provide the benefit of quickly providing a central location in memory, where the conversion code would be found, thus avoiding the time consuming task of looking for codes scattered throughout the computer memory.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF" from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—“<wxyz>” from a non-Unicode format—“pure DBCS”-- to Unicode (page 7, lines 1-17).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—“AB<wxyz>CD” from a non-Unicode format—“mixed SBCS/DBCS”-- to Unicode (page 6, lines 1-24).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—“abcDEF”-- from a non-Unicode format—“SBCS”-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

The applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the translation is performed by the computer according to a scope, the scope specifying a portion of a computer program subject to the translation.*

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to translate the portion of the computer program, because the applicant teaches above the use of Unicode format. This would provide the advantage of providing a standardized data encoding for computer programs created, and exchanged from countries using different encoding schemes.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—“abcDEF”-- from a non-Unicode format—“SBCS”-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

the applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the scope is global, the global scope specifying that the*

Art Unit: 2178

translation applies to the entire computer program. However, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings, such as all strings input into an email document, to Unicode using a mapping table—*code page*-- containing the Unicode or “second character encoding” for converting the non-Unicode string to Unicode (col.2. lines 1-67, col.3, lines 57-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of the applicant, and Edberg, because Edberg teaches ensuring the fidelity between back and forth translation between different data encodings. This would provide the advantage of providing a standardized data encoding for documents created, and exchanged from countries using different encoding schemes.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—“<wxyz>” (subsequent to the SBCS, and mixed string) from a non-Unicode format—“pure DBCS”-- to Unicode (page 7, lines 1-17). The applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the local scope specifying the subsequent portion of the computer program.* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have translated the subsequent portion of the computer program, because the applicant teaches above the use of Unicode format. This would provide the advantage of providing a standardized data encoding for computer programs created, and exchanged from countries using different encoding schemes.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF" (*specific constant*) from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

Claims 9-16 are directed towards a method for implementing the article of manufacture found in claims 1-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 17-24 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the article of manufacture found in claims 1-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 11/3/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant indicates that copies of the missing references have been resubmitted. However, the Examiner was unable to find these references in the case. Accordingly, they have not been considered.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Atkinson et al. (Pat. # 6,367,012), and Herriot (Pat. # 6,154,742).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The

Art Unit: 2178

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/21/05